

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

**PARTHENON UNIFIED MEMORY
ARCHITECTURE LLC,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., ET
AL.**

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

**Case No. 2:14-cv-902-RSP
(Lead)**

**DEFENDANTS’ NOTICE REGARDING INSTITUTION DECISIONS
FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW IN RELATED PROCEEDINGS**

Defendants Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd. and Samsung Electronics America, Inc. (“Samsung”) submit this notice to notify the Court that on March 30, 2016, the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“PTAB”) at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office instituted *Inter Partes* Review (“IPR”) proceedings for all claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 5,812,789 (“the ’789 patent”) and 5,960,464 (“the ’464 patent”) that plaintiff Parthenon Unified Memory Architecture LLC (“PUMA”) is asserting in this litigation. The decisions are attached as Exhibits A and B and further support Samsung’s pending motion for a stay of this action. *See* Dkt. 157.

PUMA currently asserts against Samsung claims 1, 3-5, 11 and 13 of the ’789 patent. The PTAB instituted IPR on all of these claims on the grounds that “there is a reasonable likelihood that Samsung would prevail in challenging claims 1, 3, 5, 11 and 13 of the ’789 patent as unpatentable under § 102(e),” and claim 4 of the ’789 patent “as unpatentable under § 103(a).”

PUMA also currently asserts against Samsung claims 1, 3, 4, 7-10, 12, 13, and 16-24 of the ’464 patent. The PTAB instituted IPR on all of these claims on the grounds that “there is a reasonable likelihood that Petitioner would prevail in challenging” them “as unpatentable under

§§ 102(b) and 103(a).” Specifically, IPR was instituted on the grounds that claims 1, 3, 4, 8-10, 12, 13, 16-21, 23, and 24 are anticipated under § 102(b), and that claims 7 and 22 are unpatentable under § 103(a).

With these decisions, IPRs have now been instituted for all five patents that PUMA is asserting against Samsung in this litigation, and Samsung respectfully submits these decisions for the Court’s consideration as it rules on Samsung’s motion for stay, which is ripe for resolution. *See* Dkt. 157.

Dated: April 1, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Allan M. Soobert

Allan M. Soobert, Lead Attorney
Robert M. Masters
PAUL HASTINGS LLP
875 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: (202) 551-1700
Facsimile: (202) 551-0222
allansoobert@paulhastings.com

Steven L. Park
PAUL HASTINGS LLP
1170 Peachtree Street, Suite 100
Atlanta, Georgia 30309
Telephone: (404) 815-2223
Facsimile: (404) 815-2424
stevenpark@paulhastings.com

Jonas Herrell
PAUL HASTINGS LLP
1117 South California Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94304
Telephone: (650) 320-1851
Facsimile: (650) 320-1951
jonasherrell@paulhastings.com

Melissa R. Smith
Texas State Bar No. 24001351
GILLAM & SMITH, LLP
303 S. Washington Ave.
Marshall, TX 75670
Telephone: (903) 934-8450
Facsimile: (903) 934-9257
melissa@gillamsmithlaw.com

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANTS SAMSUNG
ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., and SAMSUNG
ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing NOTICE has been forwarded via CM/ECF to all counsel of record on this 1st day of April, 2016.

/s/ Allan M. Soobert
Allan M. Soobert